

REMARKS

Applicant and his attorney appreciatively acknowledge the Examiner's courtesy in conducting a personal interview on August 24, 2004. It is believed that discussion of the subject matter of this case has advanced prosecution.

Applicant hereby cancels without prejudice the previously nonelected claims 8-15.

As discussed at the interview, there has been some confusion as to the IDS's submitted by Applicant in this case. On March 16, 2004, Applicant submitted by fax an IDS citing and reproducing a Japanese patent of Kobayashi and a publication of Noble. In the Action of June 17, 2004, the Examiner has initialed the form, acknowledging his consideration of these references.

Also on March 16, 2004, Applicant submitted via the US PTO's eBusiness system an electronic IDS citing 14 U.S. patents. However, as of August 23, 2004, this electronic IDS did not appear in the image file wrapper for this case.

On August 23, 2004, Applicant submitted via the US PTO's eBusiness system another electronic IDS, citing substantially the same list of U.S. patents as had been submitted on March 16th. (The new list referenced 13 of the 14 patents previously cited.) At the interview, Applicant provided the Examiner with a paper copy of the citation list submitted August 23rd.

As of November 17, 2004, the electronic IDS submitted March 16, 2004 is now part of the file history shown on PAIR, the PTO's web-based system as accessed by Applicant's attorney. Applicant invites the Examiner to review each of these 14 cited references and initial a copy of the form.

Curiously, the (substantially redundant) electronic IDS submitted August 23, 2004 did not appear on PAIR as of November 17, 2004. Applicant's attorney inquired about this with PTO paralegal Sharon Hoppe, who called back this date, saying that the IDS had been located and that all cited references are now associated with the image file wrapper of this case.

At the interview, Applicant and his attorney also discussed with the Examiner the rejections on cited art. In the Action of June 17, 2004, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from the teachings of the

Larussa patent, US 6,163,408. However it was pointed out that Larussa does not teach a second image source that provides an image that would appear in front of the other image. Larussa, in one embodiment, puts an image at infinity with a model that is not at infinity. Larussa, in another embodiment, places all images at infinity for a wider angle of view. This is different from the structure recited in Applicant's claims.

Applicant also drew the Examiner's attention to the Applicant-cited Japanese patent of Kobayashi, pointing out that it does not teach a composite image source.

The Examiner has also cited Larson U.S. patent 5,418,584 as showing a pertinent structure, but has not deemed its disclosure to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests prompt review of the case and notice of allowance. If any questions remain, the Examiner is invited to phone Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 17, 2004

/Gerry Jay Elman/
Gerry J. Elman, Reg. No., 24,404
Customer No. 003775
Elman Technology Law, P.C.
Phone: 610-892-9942